

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

*One replacement drawing sheet and one annotated drawing sheet showing changes is attached. The one replacement drawing sheet includes Figure 1 and replaces all other Figures 1 included in the drawings. Figure 1 is amended to remove the numeral "42".*

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the amendments made herein and the following remarks.

Claim 14 is newly added and recites subject matter deleted from Claim 2. Thus, Claims 1-14 are pending, with Claim 1 being independent.

The drawings are objected to because of an improper placement of the numeral "42" in Figure 1. Figure 1 is amended to remove the numeral "42" thereby addressing that issue. It is requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Certain claim amendments are made, as suggested in the Official Action, thereby addressing the issues, and it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,891,345 to Doolin, hereinafter *Doolin*.

The present application is directed to a first foot 30 and a second foot 32 that together hold a turbocharger casing of a turbocharger. According to an embodiment, the turbocharger casing is held in an axial direction that extends between the first foot 30 and the second foot 32. As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of the present application, the gas outlet casing 22, on the turbine-side end wall, has a connecting flange 40 that has the same radius as a casing connection region 34 of the second foot 32. In the example shown, the connecting flange 40 describes a full circle, thereby allowing the second foot 32 to be secured to the connecting flange 40 in any desired position with respect to the casing. In its casing connection region 34, the second foot 32 has a stop 42, so that the connecting flange 40 and the stop 42 of the casing connection region 34 engage one another in a positively locking manner to

connect the second foot 32 to the turbocharger casing 14. Thus, the connecting flange 40 connected to the turbocharger is held in the axial direction between the first foot 30 and the second foot 32 by way of the connecting region 34 of the second foot 32. See page 9, line 28 through page 10, line 20 of the present application.

Broadly encompassing that subject matter, Claim 1 recites, among other features, that a casing connection region comprises an axial stop that is in the form of a circle arc and can be connected in a positively locking manner in the axial direction to a turbocharger casing.

*Doolin* disclose supporting feet for supporting a pump. Figures 5-8 in *Doolin* show the supporting foot 28 that is relied upon by the Examiner to disclose the second supporting foot as recited in Claim 1. An adapter 14 is connected to a arcuate curved flange member 34 of the support foot 28. It is pointed out that the flange member 34 has a flat surface in an axial direction and that adapter 14 is held in the axial direction by way of a bolt 36.

Claim 1 is allowable at least because it recites, among other features, that a casing connection region comprises an axial stop that is in the form of a circle arc and can be connected in a positively locking manner in the axial direction to a turbocharger casing. *Doolin* does not disclose those features, and instead discloses a curved flange member 34 that is flat in the axial direction. The axial locking in *Doolin* is provided by a bolt 36. The differences are further illustrated by the fact that, as noted on page 9, lines 33-36 of the present application, that when the connecting flange 40 is a full circle the second foot 32 can be secured to the connecting flange 40 in any desired position, *i.e.*, rotated angle. That is simply not the case in *Doolin*, as the axial locking is provided solely by a bolt 36 that requires a

female threaded hole in the adapter 14, thereby requiring a specific angle of attachment.

For at least those reasons, *Doolin* does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of Claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejections of Claims 2 and 4-9 should also be withdrawn at least by virtue of their dependence from Claim 1.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Doolin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,244,819 to Voorhees, hereinafter *Voorhees*. *Voorhees* is only relied upon for a disclosure of the subject matter recited in Claim 3 and does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejection of Claim 1, from which Claim 3 depends. Therefore, Claim 3 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 set forth above.

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Doolin*. Claims 10-13 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence upon Claim 1 because, as relied upon in the Official Action, *Doolin* does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejection of Claim 1.

For the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 3, 2006

By: Kevin Brayton McGoff  
Kevin Brayton McGoff  
Registration No. 53,297

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703.836.6620

